

GRANTS PROCESS POLICY NOTICE 99-02
Supersedes GPPN 97-02

REVIEW POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

TITLE X FAMILY PLANNING SERVICES PROGRAM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Competitive Review	1
A. Objective Review Committee	3
1. Selection of Reviewers	3
2. Composition	3
3. Roles and Responsibilities	4
4. Preparation Prior to ORC	6
5. Scheduling of Meeting	7
6. Conduct of Meeting	7
7. Scoring	8
8. Preparation of Reviewer Summary/ ORC Report	9
9. Format of Summary Report	9
B. ORC Recommendation Options	10
C. Standards of Conduct	11
D. Confidentiality	14
E. Program Review	15
F. Grants Management Review	16
II Noncompetitive Review	17
A. Noncompeting Continuation Applications	17
B. Administrative Supplementals	17
Freedom of Information Act	18
Glossary	19
EXHIBITS	22

TITLE X FAMILY PLANNING SERVICES PROGRAM

REVIEW POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

This document establishes policies and procedures for the review of Family Planning Service Program grant proposals, competitive and noncompetitive. All requirements for competitive review have been developed in accordance with the Department of Health and Human Services Grants Administration policies. This policy is in effect for applications requesting fiscal year 1999 funds and will remain in effect until amended or rescinded.

I. COMPETITIVE REVIEW

Objective Review is the thorough and consistent examination of applications by persons knowledgeable in the field of endeavor for which support is requested.

The purpose of objective review is to provide advice to awarding officials based on an evaluation of the relevant aspects of the application.

This review process is designed to ensure that decisions are fair and impartial. The objective review of grant applications is intended to be **advisory** and is not intended to replace the delegated authority of the awarding official to decide whether a grant will be awarded.

The Grants Management Officer (GMO) is responsible for ensuring that the review process is carried out in accordance with established procedures.

The review process will be operated on a regional basis. Based on the limited number of competitive applications received on an intermittent basis by an individual region, ad-hoc committees will be used to conduct the objective review.

Objective review is applicable to new and competing continuation applications.

Applications for Projects with Time Constraints will be reviewed in accordance with the PHS Grants Administration Manual, Part 119.

DEVIATIONS FROM ESTABLISHED REVIEW PROCEDURES

The objective review process will be uniform across all regions to ensure consistency. In any instance where a Region proposes to use a review process other than the established Family Planning Services review procedures for an application, group of applications, or class of applications, **prior approval** must be obtained from the respective Regional Awarding Official with concurrence by the Grants Management Officer.

AUTHORITY TO APPOINT REVIEWERS

Members of the application review committees must be appointed by the respective Regional Health Administrators (RHA). Nominations may originate from both internal and external sources. The authority to appoint reviewers cannot be redelegated.

AWARD DECISIONS

The decision to make an award is the responsibility of the respective Regional Health Administrator. The RHA will take into account the recommendations of the objective review committee, program, and grants management.

A. OBJECTIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE (ORC)

An Objective Review Committee is a group or **three or more** reviewers brought together for the purpose of individually assessing the merit of grant applications. Committees may be composed of Federal employees, non-Federal individuals, or a combination thereof.

1. SELECTION OF REVIEWERS

The Regional Health Administrators may accept recommendations for members of review committees from Program Offices and other appropriate sources. Review committee members may also be recommended from among previously used experts, or through unsolicited expressions of interest by qualified persons. The following principles guide the staffing of the review panels:

- a) Non-Federal reviewers are selected from geographic areas that are outside the applicant's area of proposed service.
- b) Reviewers are selected on the basis of expertise in fields such as finance, clinical, management, and knowledge of family planning services.
- c) Prior experience participating with a review committee may be factored into the selection process as it impacts on commitment to quality of the review and availability to meet the time commitment.

Each region will prepare a roster of eligible reviewers and submit to the Office of Grants Management. (See EXHIBIT E).

2. COMPOSITION

Each ORC is staffed by a chairperson and three or more reviewers. A grants management advisor will be available to respond to issues regarding the objective review process, administrative and budget requirements, and/or any other grant policy related concerns. **A program resource person must be present during the ORC meeting.**

3. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The following outline depicts some of the duties and responsibilities for each member of the committee.

Chairperson: The Chairperson will be selected from the Federal or Non-Federal sector. Experience in running a review committee is preferred but not required. The ORC Chairperson is a **non-voting** committee member who presides over the objective review in accordance with established rules of order and assures complete and impartial review of each application. Specific duties include:

- a) Order of proceedings and/or preparation of an agenda.
- b) Assure that reviewers have received all relevant materials before starting the meeting.
- c) Reaffirm that no member has a conflict of interest, resolve any issues that come to light, ensure that all members (including chairperson) sign conflict of interest certifications, and turn all signed certifications over to the Grants Management Office.
- d) Assure that reviewers are aware of their responsibilities and understand procedures to be followed in reviewing, voting on, and rating applications.
- e) Collect Primary and Secondary Reviewer Reports; and Individual Score Sheets (assuring that scores are properly tabulated.)
- f) Ensure preparation of objective review summary report.
- g) Submit entire package to Regional Program Consultant.

Reviewers: Each ORC will consist of three or more qualified reviewers knowledgeable in Family Planning Services selected from the Federal and/or Non-Federal sector. A Primary Reviewer and Secondary Reviewer will be identified for each application. All reviewers are voting members of the review committee.

- a) A **primary reviewer** is responsible for reading the entire application, evaluating it against prescribed criteria, and completing a Reviewer Summary Report prior to

arriving at the meeting. Copies of the report (in writing and on 3.5" disc in WordPerfect 6.0 or above) should be brought to the ORC meeting. At the meeting, the Primary Reviewer provides an oral summary of the application to the committee as a whole.

- b) A **Secondary reviewer** is also responsible for reading the entire application, evaluating it against prescribed criteria, and completing a Reviewer Summary Report prior to arriving at the meeting. Copies of the written report should be brought to the ORC meeting. The Secondary Reviewer contributes to the oral summary of the application when his/her comments add substantially to, or differ markedly from, that of the Primary Reviewer.
- c) Other reviewers will read applications, participate in the discussion and score applications.

Grants Management Staff: Grants Management staff will ensure that policies and procedures for each ORC are carried out in accordance with prescribed requirements. Grants Management representative is non-voting member. If not in attendance at the ORC meeting, the Grants staff will be available to the committee through phone calls or electronic communications. Examples of duties of Grants staff are:

- a) participates in orientation to reinforce understanding of the review process (reviewer presentation, voting, scoring, etc.);
- b) collects signed conflict of interest certifications from the Chairperson once they have been signed at the beginning of the meeting;
- c) assures that PHS and Family Planning Services program requirements for the ORC process are observed.
- d) advises on PHS grants policy issues
- e) clarifies administrative requirements and budget justifications; and
- f) ensures that all materials provided to the reviewers and used by the reviewers are collected and appropriately taken care of.

Program Resource Staff: Program Resource staff are required to attend the ORC. Their role will be to provide or clarify information on the program guidelines, and/or application instructions, as needed by the committee. They may respond to questions from the committee. Program resource staff will not interfere with the committee deliberations, nor will they provide opinions which would influence the committee's final recommendation.

4. PREPARATION PRIOR TO THE ORC

Review committee managers in the individual regions will:

- a) Develop ORC schedule for each fiscal year
- b) Select reviewers from approved roster
- c) Assign primary and secondary reviewers
- d) Prepare written notification to reviewers of appointments to be signed by RHA
- e) Initiate request form for non-federal reviewers to be paid through TA contract
- f) Select a chairperson
- g) Brief chairperson on the number and types of applications to be reviewed
- h) Notify chairperson in advance of meeting when Federal staff plan to observe ORC

OGM staff will ensure that all pertinent materials are distributed to reviewers at least **three (3) weeks** prior to the date of the meeting. Additional materials needed by reviewers should be requested from OGM.

Reviewers will receive copies of all applications to be reviewed by the committee.

After reviewers have received their applications, a conference call will be arranged between program, OGM and reviewers. The purpose of the call will be to:

- . discuss reviewer responsibilities
- . review time and place of meeting
- . discuss the review criteria to ensure that reviewers understand its intent
- . reinforce that all reviewer summary reports must be prepared in advance of the meeting.

The Primary Reviewer Summary Report is to be in written form and on a 3.5" disc in Wordperfect 6.0 or above. The Primary Reviewer Summary Report will be updated based on results of the committee deliberations and become the ORC Report.

5. SCHEDULING OF MEETINGS

Each region shall determine at the beginning of each fiscal year the number of objective review committees necessary to review all anticipated grant applications. The regional managers select reviewers from their approved rosters for a committee and notify OGM of their selections.

Meetings will be scheduled far enough in advance to allow at least three weeks for reviewers to prepare reviewer reports for the meeting.

The meetings must be held on a schedule that allows adequate time at the end of the decision process for Grants Management staff to carry out their required functions. **Final decision documents must be in OGM no later than thirty (30) days prior to the project start date.**

6. CONDUCT OF THE MEETING

Open/Closed Sessions: The review of grant applications is considered closed to the public. Only Federal staff will be allowed to observe the process; however, their presence must be cleared by the Chairperson and the GMO. Observers must abide by confidentiality rules. (See page 15)

Orientation: The chairperson will review standard principles of conduct of an ORC meeting. Any orientation provided by the Program Office will take place at the beginning of the closed session. At the end of the orientation, the Chairperson will read the rules of conflict of interest and confidentiality, and ask each reviewer to sign and turn in a conflict of interest statement. The orientation will include a discussion of:

- a) an overview of review procedures;
- b) the intent of the programmatic initiative (provided by the appropriate program resource person; and
- c) an understanding of the evaluation criteria. The purpose of the discussion is to ensure that everyone is interpreting the criteria in the same manner.

Discussion and Voting: The Primary and Secondary Reviewers will present their findings to the full committee. The Chairperson will then lead the full committee in a discussion of the application after which reviewers will vote individually on the recommendation for each application. **Primary Reviewers will be responsible for modifying, if necessary, the preliminary Reviewer Summary Report/ORC Report after the discussion, to reflect the finding of the full committee.**

Absence of Reviewers: If the assigned Primary Reviewer is absent due to an emergency, the meeting will be rescheduled. If the secondary reviewer or one of the other members are absent due to an emergency, the chairperson will make a determination of whether or not to reschedule the meeting.

7. SCORING

All reviewers will score each application.

Review committees shall not use instructions and scoring sheets that have not been cleared by the GMO.

The maximum score an applicant can obtain is 150 points for the entire application and each evaluation criteria is weighted to contribute to the total points. Points for each criteria are based on program guidelines and priorities. Steps to be taken in the voting and scoring of applications at the ORC meeting include:

- a) Each member of the review committee receives an individual score sheet for each application being reviewed.
- b) The Primary Reviewer presents the application and the Secondary Reviewer has an opportunity to provide additional comments. Other committee members are given an opportunity to provide additional comments and/or ask questions.
- c) After the discussion, the Chairperson asks the Primary Reviewer to recommend Approval, Disapproval, or Deferral. The Chairperson will ask the full committee to concur or nonconcur with a show of hands and a tally of the vote is recorded.
- d) If the recommendation is Disapproval, and the disapproval is based on the applicant having scored "0" on one or more review criteria (i.e., the criteria were not addressed), the disapproved application will not be scored. However, if the Disapproval is based on general weaknesses, the reviewers will vote their individual scores.
- e) The Chairperson will then ask committee members whether there has been sufficient discussion of the application for them to record an individual score. (There needs to be enough discussion to determine if and where there are differences of opinion.)
- f) After discussion has been completed, the Chairperson will ask the primary reviewer to restate his/her overall assessment and score based on the input and exchange from the full committee. Then, the Chairperson will instruct committee members to vote their own numerical score on the individual score sheet. Reviewers who do

not agree with the Primary Reviewer's recommendation may be asked by the Chair to provide an additional written statement to support why they disagree so that this information can be included in the final ORC Recommendation.

- g) At the end of the meeting, the Chairperson will collect the individual score sheets and review them to assure scores are tabulated correctly. The average of all of the reviewers' scores will determine the application's final numerical score.
- h) When appropriate, the final numerical score of all Approved or Deferred applications will be used to develop the ranking list for funding purposes. The individual score sheets will be appropriately disposed of after OGM has reviewed and approved the final ranking list.

8. PREPARATION OF REVIEWER SUMMARY/ORC REPORT

At the close of the review, the Chairperson will review the Primary Reviewer Summary/ORC Report to ensure that all changes discussed at the meeting are reflected in that Report. If modifications to the Report are necessary, it is the Chairperson's responsibility to see that those modifications are accurately recorded and that the final ORC Report supports the score and overall assessment of the full committee.

Should an element in the review criteria not be applicable to a specific applicant (e.g., the applicant does not have delegate agencies) the item should be marked as not applicable (N/A) and given the full score in order to not impose a penalty when scoring and rating.

The Chairperson will forward all reports within five (5) working days to the designated program staff person.

9. FORMAT OF SUMMARY REPORT WILL INCLUDE:

- a) Organization's Name, Grant Number, and funds requested.
- b) Recommendation: Approval, Disapproval or Deferral (See Page 11)
- c) Brief overview/description of the organization
- d) General narrative of each individual criteria, followed by specific citations of strengths and weaknesses. Reviewers should site sections (with page numbers) of the application that support their findings.
- e) Conditions of Grant Award: Reviewers should identify issues that in their opinion must be met by the applicant before they receive the grant award or within a

specified time frame after the award. **Unmet** conditions on a grant award may be cause for termination of the award.

- f) Advisory Comments: Reviewers may make specific suggestions to be conveyed to the grantee or for program staff to consider in managing the grant.
- g) On the final page of the report, the names of the Primary and Secondary Reviewers will be identified. The report will be signed and dated by the Chairperson.

B. ORC RECOMMENDATION OPTIONS

Once each ORC has completed its review of the application content, the group will formulate its recommendations to be presented to the Regional Health Administrator. The basic decision to be made is whether to approve the application for new or continuing funding support. After a decision is made to recommend approval of an application, recommendations must be made on the length of the project period, and the specific conditions of the award or other advisory language that should be transmitted along with the award. These decision rules should govern reviewers in making recommendations and help ensure that all grantees are assessed equitably.

Reviewers have the following recommendation options for **FINAL** action on an application:

1. APPROVAL

1 Year Project Period

An application should be approved with a 1 year project period when the applicant is determined to have a deficiency in one or more significant areas of the program guidelines.

The deficiency(s) warrants a 1 year project period when the review team concludes that continued funding beyond the upcoming budget period should be tied to correcting the problem(s). Generally, a deficiency should be communicated as a condition of the award, describing the specific action(s) that must be taken or specific deliverables that must be produced by a given date.

Up to a 5 Year Project Period

An application may be approved for up to a 5 year project period when:

- a) the applicant is compliant or nearly compliant with all program and administrative requirements; and

- b) the area of noncompliance, if any, must be considered correctable and not to have an impact on the provision of services;

2. **DISAPPROVAL**

- a) Applications that are recommended for disapproval because they scored "0" on one or more review criteria (i.e. the criteria were not addressed) should not be scored. If the Disapproval is based on deficiencies reviewers should proceed to vote their individual scores. A major deficiency should be interpreted as having a detrimental impact on the applicant's ability to provide services.
- b) In cases where there is head-to-head competition, the review team may recommend only one application for funding. **If there is no applicant that the review committee finds approvable, then all applicants should be recommended for Disapproval.**
- c) An application from a new organization should be disapproved if the reviewers conclude that the applicant clearly does not meet program requirements, nor does the applicant demonstrate an ability to administer the grant or to meet program requirements within a reasonable period of time.

3. **DEFERRAL - For a Specified Period of Time**

An application may be deferred for a specific period of time if, in the opinion of the reviewers, a decision to approve or disapprove the application cannot and/or should not be made until a specific piece of information is available. As long as the information needed to complete the decision making process is clear and objectively stated, a decision for final action can be made by the respective Regional Health Administrator upon its receipt.

C. **STANDARDS OF CONDUCT**

In keeping with PHS policy regarding conflict of interest, every effort is made to avoid conflict, or appearance thereof, when selecting members to participate on ORCs. Program offices and the Office of Grants Management (OGM) screen reviewers and applications prior to distribution to objective reviewers to try to ensure that no conflicts exist.

A reviewer has a potential conflict of interest in an application if the reviewer, his or her spouse, parent, minor child, or partner:

1. Serves as an officer, director, trustee, partner, or employee of the applicant, its parent or subsidiary organization;
2. Is negotiating or has an arrangement concerning prospective employment (or other similar association) with the applicant, its parent or subsidiary organization, or
3. Has a financial interest, within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. 208, in the application or in the applicant, its parent or subsidiary organization.

OGM and program can only look for obvious associations and make conflict of interest inquiries of the prospective reviewers before distribution of the material. Despite these precautions, a conflict of interest may nevertheless occur. It is incumbent upon reviewers to declare any potential conflict. If any reviewer feels that he/she may have a conflict, financial or otherwise, with an application he/she is assigned to review, it is the responsibility of that reviewer to report that conflict to the OGM. The application will be assigned to another reviewer, but the services of the reviewer may be retained for the remainder of the applications. In this case, the Chairperson must arrange for the reviewer with the conflict to absent him/herself from the committee meeting during the discussion of that application, and no information about the application or its review may be provided to the reviewer.

Unreported or undetected conflicts of interest undermine the entire review process. Prior to convening the review meeting, reviewers and chairperson will be asked to sign a conflict of interest certification that they are not participating in the review of any application where their presence involves a conflict of interest. (See Exhibit D)

1. Federal Reviewer Restrictions

The following additional restrictions apply to the selection of Federal staff members as chairpersons/reviewers:

1. In selecting persons from the Regional Office staff, selections will not include anyone from the cognizant program office who, on behalf of the Federal Government, performed or is likely to perform any of the following duties for any of the applications or projects being reviewed (e.g., project officer, regional program consultant (RPC), or grants management officer).
 - a) Stimulated submission of the application.
 - b) Provided substantial technical assistance to the applicant.

- c) Reviewed or made recommendations concerning the application in any capacity except as a member of the current review committee.
 - d) Participated previously in approving or disapproving the application.
 - e) Served as the project officer or otherwise monitoring or evaluating the grantee's programmatic performance.
 - f) Served as the grants management officer or performed grants management functions for the project.
 - g) Audited or performed a Comprehensive Program Review of the applicant.
- 2. The objective review committee may not include anyone who has line authority over a person who is ineligible for the committee because of 1. a) & b) above (e.g., Deputy RHA or RHA).
 - 3. Except when prohibited by 18 U.S.C. 208, or 45 CFR Part 73, Regional Office staff who are ineligible for a review committee because of any items above, may review and make recommendations about other competing applications, but not as members of the objective review group.
 - 4. If, after the fact, there is a need to change project officer designations, thereby resulting in an individual who participated in the review of an application being appointed as the project officer, this will not be considered a violation of policy provided the assignment was not expected when the competitive review was conducted.

2. Non-Federal Reviewer Restrictions

The following additional restrictions apply to the selection of Non-Federal reviewers:

- a. Individuals selected must not have been employees of PHS regional offices, including having line authority over the Family Planning Services program office, for one (1) year prior to participation as a reviewer in the objective review process.
- b. No two members of the same committee should be from the same organization or institution.

- c. Individuals selected may not have provided any type of technical assistance to the applicant or any competitor including being a member of a Comprehensive Program Review Team for one year.
- d. Individuals may not have been engaged in pursuing or having pending an agreement for employment or any type of contractual relationship.
- e. Individuals may not have a pending grant application competing for the same program funding as the grant applications currently under objective review.

D. CONFIDENTIALITY

All review materials are privileged information.

Do not discuss applications or review outcomes with applicants, other reviewers, or anyone not involved in the review process.

Do not reproduce application materials or remove application from the review location.

1. Review Materials

Review materials and proceedings of review meetings are privileged information for use only by review committee members and program staff. At no time during or after the review of applications, should the reviewer discuss the applications, comments, recommendations, evaluations, review scores, names of applicants, or names of other reviewers with anyone not involved in the review process. In addition, discussion with other reviewers is not permitted outside the meeting setting.

Direct contact with applicants is strictly prohibited. Applications are submitted to the OGM in confidence, and confidentiality must be respected.

Applications may not be photocopied by reviewers, nor may they be removed from the review setting. All applicant materials will be collected at the close of review deliberations and returned to the program office or the OGM.

2. Breach of Confidentiality

Inappropriate disclosure of review proceedings is considered a breach of confidentiality and represents an improper intrusion into the privileged nature of the proceedings. Breach of

confidentiality ignores the rights of applicants to their proposed work and invades the privacy of fellow review committee members. A significant result of such a breach of confidentiality could be legal exposure, as well as to disqualify a current reviewer from continuing with the current proceedings and to bar that reviewer from participating in future reviews.

E. PROGRAM REVIEW

Program staff review applications from a programmatic point of view for conformity to laws, regulations and policies, technical programmatic aspects and the overall plan including budget aspects. They identify problem areas and collaborate with the Office of Grants Management in their resolution. A specific review format has not been prescribed for program reviews but review functions by program staff include, but are not limited to:

- C Analyze goals and objectives for conformance to those embodied in the legislation;
- C Analyze service delivery need and demand aspects of the application based on previous experience, statistics and evidence submitted by the applicant;
- C Relate project to existing resources in the area, noting potential linkages and/or duplicative efforts;
- C Analyze staffing projections in terms of numbers, appropriateness, capability, experience and training;
- C Evaluate progress reports for aspects such as quality of services rendered, effectiveness of planning and development activities, support of community and existing resources;
- C Analyze plans, including such documents as milestone charts for feasibility, completeness, compatibility with staffing and budget projections;
- C Evaluate facility plans in terms of appropriateness, efficiency and location;
- C Evaluate needs for items of equipment requested; and
- C In conjunction with the Office of Grants Management, evaluate financial stability of project.

This review will be considered in the final decision process but will not be presented to the objective review committee.

F. GRANTS MANAGEMENT REVIEW

Grants Management reviews each application for completeness by determining adequacy of budget and budget justification, inclusion of programmatic information as required in the announcement, and inclusion of all required forms, assurances, and certifications. This review will be documented on a standard application review checklist.

In cooperation with program staff, grants management determines if any applications do not conform to the announcement on the availability of funds. Applications that do not conform to the announcement will not undergo objective review and will be returned to the applicant with an explanatory letter signed by the Grants Management Officer.

An in-depth grants management review of the budget and financial plan is performed on all competing continuation applications.

For **approved new** applications, a financial evaluation will be performed to assess the applicant's financial management capability to properly administer the project, that requested grant funds are reasonable for performance of the project and that systems are in place to properly safeguard the funds.

Results of OGM's review will be provided to the respective regional program staff within two (2) days after the objective review committee meets.

The OGM's review will be considered in the decision process but will **not** be shared with the objective review committee.

II. NONCOMPETITIVE REVIEW

Noncompetitive review is applicable to requests for continuation of support for individual budget periods within an approved project period and administrative supplementals.

A. Noncompeting Continuation Applications

Noncompeting continuation applications will be reviewed by program staff to determine if a grantee's performance warrants continuation of funding. Grants Management will review applications for completeness and review the budget. The program and grants management will discuss each application and resolve any outstanding issues.

A **Program Recommendation (Exhibit G)** must be provided to OGM **no later than thirty (30) days prior to the budget start date** of the period for which funds are requested.

B. Administrative Supplementals

Administrative supplementals will be reviewed by program and grants management staff to determine the appropriateness of the request and the availability of current fiscal year funds or unobligated balances to fund the request.

A funding **memorandum** must be provided to the OGM. If this type of action occurs in the last month of the fiscal year, the funding memorandum must be in OGM no later than close of business on September 15.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT

The Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requires release of certain grant documents and records requested in writing by members of the public. These policies and regulations apply only to information in the possession of PHS. The following types of material will generally be released.

Funded applications

Notices of Grant Award

Financial Status Reports

Final Reports

If an organization or person other than the applicant organization submits an FOIA request, the applicant organization will be notified of the FOIA request by the FOIA officer and will be given an opportunity to identify information of a proprietary nature. After consideration of the grantee's submission, the grantee will be informed by the agency's decision as to what documents and to whom the documents will be released.

The following types of records or information will generally be **withheld** in response to FOIA requests:

Pending grant applications

Unfunded new and competing continuation application and competing supplemental applications

Financial information regarding a person, such as salary information pertaining to project personnel

Information pertaining to an individual, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

Opinions in interagency or intra-agency memoranda or letters expressed by Government officers, employees, or consultants

Trade secrets and commercial, financial, and otherwise intrinsically valuable information that are obtained from an organization and are privileged or confidential; information, the release of which would adversely affect the competitive position of the organization, and patent or other valuable commercial rights of the organization.

If a document contains both disclosable and nondisclosable information, the nondisclosable information will be deleted by a designated FOIA Officer, and the balance of the record will be disclosed.

GLOSSARY

Ad-hoc Committee:	A temporary committee established to perform a specific short-term task, after which the committee disbands. The committee will have no formal structure and no officers will be appointed.
Administrative Supplemental:	A request for additional funding within an approved budget period to meet increased administrative costs that are anticipated during that period, such as fringe benefits, salary increases, or other organizational costs not included in the grant application.
Advisory Comments:	ORC suggestions to be conveyed to the grantee or program staff to consider in managing the grant.
Applicant:	The institution, public or private nonprofit corporation, organization, agency or other legally accountable entity that applies for a grant, and, which if awarded a grant, will assume legal and financial responsibility and accountability both for the awarded funds and for the performance of the grant-supported activity.
Budget Period:	The interval of time (usually 12 months) into which the grant project is divided for budgeting, awarding and reporting purposes.
Cognizant Program Office:	The program office assigned responsibility for managing the grant program.
Conditions:	A statement included on the Notice of Grant Award of specific action(s) to be taken by the grantee or specific deliverable(s) required from the grantee by a certain date. In some cases the conditions may require action or a deliverable prior to an award.

Objective Review:	The thorough and consistent examination of applications by persons knowledgeable in the field of endeavor for which support is requested.
Objective Review Committee:	An Objective Review Committee is a group of three or more reviewers, knowledgeable in the subject area of the applications, brought together for the purpose of individually assessing the merit of grant applications. Committees may be composed of Federal employees, non-Federal individuals, or a combination thereof.
Primary Reviewer:	Objective reviewer who has lead responsibility for reading and evaluating an application against prescribed criteria, presenting an oral summary of the application to the ORC members, and preparing written comments.
Project Scope:	The scope of services/activities identified in the grant application and approved for support.
Project Period:	The total time for which support of a project has been programmatically approved. A project period may consist of one or more budget periods. The total project period comprises the original project period and any extensions thereof.
Review Committee Manager:	Program staff assigned to make arrangements for ORC meetings.

Secondary
Reviewer:

Objective reviewer who also has responsibility for reading and evaluating an application against prescribed criteria and preparing written comments. The Secondary Reviewer contributes to the oral summary of the application when his/her comments add substantially to, or differ markedly from, the Primary Reviewer.

Standard
Provisions:

Standard provisions are Terms and Conditions required on each notice of grant award. These are legal requirements imposed on the grant by the Federal Government by statute, regulations, award notice, or other document.

Special
Provisions:

Additional terms and conditions that are judged necessary to attain the objectives for which the grant is being made, facilitate postaward administration of the grant, conserve grant funds, or otherwise protect the interest of the Federal Government.

EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT A**SUMMARY OF REVIEWERS AND STAFF RESPONSIBILITIES**

RESPONSIBILITY	PRIMARY REVIEWER	SECONDARY REVIEWER	OTHER REVRs	REG. PRO-GRAM STAFF	OGM
Screen applications for eligibility and conformance to announcement				X	X
Develop roster of approved reviewers				X	
Concur on reviewer rosters					X
Approve documents used by ORC					X
Develop ORC schedule				X	
Select reviewers				X	
Assign reviewers				X	X
Brief reviewers				X	
Select chairperson				X	
Brief chairperson				X	
Distribute materials to reviewers					X
Read and evaluate appls. against prescribed criteria	X	X		X	
Prepared written summary reports	X	X			
Score applications	X	X	X	X	
Participate in discussion	X	X	X		
Recommend action, including special conditions/advice	X	X	X	X	X
Prepared ORC Summary Report	X				
Program resource; interpretation of requirements				X	
Advise on grants policy, administrative and budget issues					X

EXHIBIT B

APPLICATION REVIEW CYCLES

COMPETITIVE

Number of Calendar Days Prior to Project Start Date

120 days	Application due
60 days	Objective Review Committee meets
30 days	Funding Decision to OGM
15 days	Notice of Grant Award issued

NONCOMPETITIVE

Number of Calendar Days Prior to Budget Start Date

90 days	Application due
30 days	Funding Decision to OGM
15 days	Notice of Grant Award issued

The above dates are deadlines. Actions may occur earlier. Funding decisions will be processed by OGM as soon as received in priority order by budget start date.

EXHIBIT C

**PLANNING CHECKLIST
REVIEW COMMITTEE MANAGEMENT**

The following are some of the review committee management steps which need to be addressed in the planning and operation of the review committee.

- ☐1. Review committee selected from approved roster.
- ☐2. Applications assigned to reviewers.
- ☐3. RHA notify reviewers of appointment to a committee.
- ☐4. OGM notified of reviewer selection.
- ☐5. Review committee or new members oriented to program.
- ☐6. Review committee members duties have been discussed with them.
- ☐7. Review meeting date, time and place have been established and communicated to appropriate program and grants staff, reviewers and chairperson.
- ☐8. Review committee chairperson identified and briefed.
- ☐9. Applications, conflict of interest statements, reviewer summary report formats, and score sheets have been provided to reviewers.
- ☐10. Chairperson notified in advance of meeting when federal staff plan to observe ORC.
- ☐11. Room reserved for meeting.

EXHIBIT D

CONFLICT OF INTEREST CERTIFICATION

To provide maximum objectivity, reviewers of a grant application may not have any direct relationship with the applicant institution and may not have any personal, job related or financial interest in the award of a grant to that institution. All circumstances that might introduce into the review process any conflict of interest, or the appearance thereof, or any prejudices, biases, or predispositions on the part of the reviewers must be avoided. The responsible official shall not appoint a reviewer to a committee who has a known or potential conflict of interest.

A reviewer has a potential conflict of interest in an application if the reviewer, his or her spouse, parent, minor child, or partner:

1. Serves as an officer, director, trustee, partner, or employee of the applicant, its parent or subsidiary organization;
2. Is negotiating or has an arrangement concerning prospective employment (or other similar association) with the applicant, its parent or subsidiary organization, or
3. Has a financial interest, within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. 208, in the application or in the applicant, its parent or subsidiary organization.

Based on the above criteria, I certify that I have no business or operating interest nor any direct or indirect relationship either financial or operational that would represent a conflict of interest with respect to the grant applications I have been asked to review for the Family Planning Services program.

Reviewer's Signature and Date

Affiliation

Address

EXHIBIT E

**ROSTER OF ELIGIBLE REVIEWERS
TITLE X FAMILY PLANNING SERVICES PROGRAM**

REGION:__

FISCAL YEAR: __

Name, Title, and Address	Phone #	Area of Expertise

Regional Program Consultant

Date

Grants Management Officer

Date

Regional Health Administrator

Date

EXHIBIT F**Application Review Checklist**

Grant # _____ Year of Support _____

Applicant name: _____

City _____ State _____

Program: _____

Type of Application: ____ Competing ____ Non-Competing ____ NEW

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>N/A</u>	Check Appropriate Item
I.	_____	_____	_____	Proof of non-Profit status (IRS Letter)(*) (<u>NEW ONLY</u>)
II.	_____	_____	_____	Face Page, SF 424, Original signature(*)
	_____	_____	_____	SF 424B Stand Assurances - Original signature (*)
	_____	_____	_____	Certifications original signature(*) Page 17, 18, 19 of the PHS 5161-1
III.	_____	_____	_____	SF 424A Budget Information
IV	_____	_____	_____	Evidence of submission to SPOC(*)
V.	_____	_____	_____	Checklist(*)Page 25 & 26 of the PHS 5161-1
VI	_____	_____	_____	Public Health Impact Statement (<u>Non-Profit Only</u> , N/A to public agencies)(*)
VII.	_____	_____	_____	Specific program eligibility requirements met

Specify items: (refer to announcement)

_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

Comment:

VIII. Exhibits (required submission):

_____ Exhibit A - Service Site Information
 _____ Exhibit B - Services Provided
 _____ Exhibit C - Title X Assurance of Compliance

IX. Congressional District/Districts _____

X. Verify 9-digit zip code _____.

XI. EIN # _____ (GMS verify)

(*) These items may require follow-up by OGM staff.

COMPETING(NEW) APPLICATION DISPOSITION:

_____ Late - do not accept
 _____ Ineligible applicant - do not accept
 _____ Does not conform to announcement - do not accept
 _____ Accept

<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>N/A</u>	
_____	_____	_____	In-kind value documented?
_____	_____	_____	Program income projected?
_____	_____	_____	Latest FSR accepted? (continuations)
_____	_____	_____	Latest Audit received? (continuations)
_____	_____	_____	Progress reports accepted? (continuations)
_____	_____	_____	Indirect cost rate verified?
_____	_____	_____	Prior terms and conditions met (continuations)?
_____	_____	_____	Unallowable costs? If yes, explain.

Comments on budget:

Comments on applicant's ability to manage and safeguard Federal funds, including any outstanding audit issues:

Recommended Action:

_____ Approval _____ Disapproval _____ Deferral

(If disapproval or deferral provide rationale.)

Recommended Funding level: \$ _____
(Explain if different than requested level)

Recommended Special Terms/Conditions:

Recommended Remarks:

Grants Management Specialist

Date

Revised July 1998

ACTION:	_____APPROVAL	TYPE OF ACTION	<input type="checkbox"/> NEW
	_____DISAPPROVAL		<input type="checkbox"/> COMPETING CONTINUATION
	_____DEFERRAL		<input type="checkbox"/> SUPPLEMENT
			<input type="checkbox"/> NON-COMPETING CONTINUATION
			<input type="checkbox"/> EXTENSION WITH SUPPLEMENT
			<input type="checkbox"/> EXTENSION W/OUT SUPPLEMENT

1. TO BE COMPLETED BY PROGRAM STAFF.
2. ORIGINAL SHOULD BE RECEIVED IN OGM NO LATER THAN 30 DAYS PRIOR TO START DATE OF BUDGET PERIOD
3. OGM STAFF COMPLETE NGA AND MAIL TO BE RECEIVED BY GRANTEE 15 DAYS PRIOR TO START DATE
(PROGRAM STAFF REVIEWS SHOULD BE ATTACHED TO THIS FUNDING MEMORANDUM)

PAGE 2 – FUNDING MEMORANDUM CONT.

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS:

OTHER REMARKS:

OTHER INFORMATION AS NEEDED: I.E. NAME OF BOARD CHAIRMAN OR HIGHER LEVEL OFFICIAL OF THE GRANTEE ORGANIZATION

EXPANDED AUTHORITY: (YES / NO (circle one) IF NO, EXPLAIN)

SUBMITTED BY:

REGIONAL PROGRAM CONSULTANT

SIGNATURE

DATE

CONCUR BY:

GRANTS MANAGEMENT DIRECTOR

SIGNATURE

DATE

APPROVED BY:

REGIONAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATOR

SIGNATURE

DATE

Revised July 1998